

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMOND FLORES,

Plaintiff,

v.

TESLA, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:23-cv-01735-CDB

ORDER ON STIPULATION TRANSFERRING
ACTION TO THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

ORDER EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR
DEFENDANT TO RESPOND TO THE
COMPLAINT

(Doc. 11)

Pending before the Court is the stipulation of the parties, filed February 27, 2024, for order transferring this action to the Central District of California. (Doc. 11). The parties represent that transfer is warranted given that an earlier-filed action pending in that District (*Reynolds v. Tesla, Inc.*, Case No. 2:23-cv-09665-HDV-RAO (C.D. Cal.)) raises substantially similar claims as alleged in the action pending before this Court. *Id.*

Under the first-to-file rule, a court may dismiss a complaint or claim that is duplicative, transfer all or parts of the case to the first-filed district or stay all or parts of the case pending a decision in the prior-related action. *See Heinz v. Mazda Motor of America, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-02058-TLN-CKD, 2023 WL 4305118, at *1 (E.D. Cal. June 30, 2023) (citing *Kohn Law Grp., Inc. v. Auto Parts Mfg. Miss., Inc.*, 787 F.3d 1237, 1239-40 (9th Cir. 2015)).

The Court having considered the parties' stipulation to transfer and to extend Defendant's deadline to respond to the complaint, the pleading sand other papers on file in this action, as well as the factors articulated in *Kohn Law Grp.*, **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. This case shall be transferred to the Central District of California, so that it can be

1 related to the earlier-filed matter captioned *Reynolds v. Tesla, Inc.*, Case No. 2:23-
2 cv-09665-HDB-RAO (C.D. Cal.).

3 2. The deadline for Defendant to respond to the complaint shall be extended through
4 and including March 19, 2024.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: March 1, 2024


7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE